REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-23, 25-34, 36-45, 47-55, and 60-68 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-3, 6-23, 25-34, 36-45, 47-55, and 60-68 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 16, 19, 20-23, 33, 34, 44, 45, 55, and 58 have been amended.

Formal Matters

Appreciation is expressed for the telephonic interview conducted on March 4, 2009 between Examiner Joo and Shawn Doman, Applicants' counsel. During the interview, the Gupta reference was discussed with reference to independent claim 1. The undersigned believes this paper is in harmony with the positions expressed during the interview.

The Specification is objected to as purportedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o) for the phrase "computer readable storage medium." In accordance with the Examiner's suggestions, made during the above-mentioned interview, Applicants include herein clarifying amendments to the Specification (specifically page 21) and respectfully submit that this objection is overcome thereby.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-3, 6-23, 25-34, 36-45, 47-55, 58, 60-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as purportedly failing to comply with the written description requirement and 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as purportedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that these rejections are moot in view of the amendments presented herein. The amended claims do not contain the "other than" language that formed the Examiner's basis for these rejections.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,763,384 issued to Gupta et al. ("Gupta"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As discussed in more detail below, Applicants respectfully submit that Gupta fails to teach each element of claim 22. For example, amended independent claim 22 recites ""the incoming event comprises a request to establish communication with a user," and "the wait request, taken alone, enables the web server to push the asynchronous message to the web browser." Applicants respectfully submit that Gupta fails to teach at least these features.

Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 6-21, 23, 25-34, 36-45, 47-55, 58, 60-68 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,928,325 issued to Shaughnessy et al. ("Shaughnessy"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed combination of Gupta and Shaughnessy fails to disclose each limitation of amended independent claim 1, which recites:

A method comprising:
    controlling a user interface presented by a web browser comprising:
        causing a web server to push an asynchronous message to the web browser
            in response to an incoming event, wherein
                the incoming event comprises a request to establish
                    communication with a user;
                the web browser presents a user interface change in response to the
                    asynchronous message, and
                the incoming event is received by a communication server;
        causing the web browser to provide a wait request to the web server
            wherein, the wait request is associated with the web browser, and
            the wait request, taken alone, enables the web server to push the
            asynchronous message to the web browser;
        identifying a source of the asynchronous message; and
        associating the wait request with the source, wherein the associating
            identifies the web browser as a recipient of the asynchronous
            message.

Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed combination fails to teach, at least, "the incoming event comprises a request to establish communication with a user," and "the wait request, taken alone, enables the web server to push the asynchronous message to the web browser." As an initial matter, support for these amendments is found, at least, at page 13 ("incoming events, such as customer service requests") and page 16 ("to indicate web browser client 104A is available to receive an asynchronous message, Java applet 16 causes web browser client 104A to send a wait request 210 to web server 188.")

Regarding the limitation that recites that "the incoming event comprises a request to establish communication with a user," the Office Action correlates the claimed incoming event with "an online indication of the client" or alternatively a "received message," as taught by the following section of Gupta:

> Upon detection, by one of the application servers **20 - 24**, of one of the messages/events of interest to the various clients (i.e. Table 1), the notification process is performed. The relevant application server passes the message, which is married to the relevant client(s)' receiving address, to the notification server. The on-line clients **110 - 118** receive the messages sent by the notification server **30**, interpret these messages and display them to the end user.

Gupta 6:54-59 (cited at Office Action, p. 9). Applicants respectfully submit that Gupta's messages/events are not comparable to the claimed incoming event, for at least the reason that Gupta fails to disclose that the messages/events comprise a request to establish communication with a user. This is unsurprising since Gupta is not directed to establishing communications with a user. As discussed in the Interview referenced above, Applicants disclose a method of notifying users agents of incoming customer support requests so that the agents can respond to the incoming requests. On the other hand, Gupta is directed to notifying a client when particular item of requested (by the client) information becomes available. *See* Gupta, Abstract. As disclosed in the above passage, Gupta's messages/events are notifications that the particular information which a client has requested is available. These messages are not comparable to the claimed incoming event, which comprises a request to establish communication with a user.

Regarding the limitation that recites "the wait request, taken alone, enables the web server to push the asynchronous message to the web browser," the Office Action correlates the claimed wait request with Gupta's client registration, as disclosed in the following passage:

> The client process **110** notifies one or more of the application servers **20 - 24** of what messages the end user wishes to receive. The client process **110** can dynamically update this list of desired messages according to the end user's preferences. The client process **110** may disconnect from the network **10** after sending this list of desired messages. When the client process **110** is ready to receive messages, it registers itself with the notification server **30**. The registration information required by the notification server **30** will comprise the identity of the client process **110** together with a receiving address identifier.

Gupta 5:43-54 (cited at Office Action, p. 3). Applicants respectfully submit that Gupta's client registration is not comparable to the claimed wait request, for at least the reason that Gupta's registration, taken alone, does not enable a web server to push an asynchronous message to a web browser. As discussed in the above-referenced Interview, Gupta requires at least two transmissions from the client to the server to enable the server to transmit information to the client. In order for Gupta's system to transfer any information to a client, the client must not only register, but must also provide a list of desired messages to an application server. On the other hand, claim 1 makes clear that a wait request, taken alone, enables the web server to push an asynchronous message. No other transmission of information from the client to the server is required. This is unlike Gupta, which requires both the transmission of the list of desired messages and also a registration message.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claim 1, as well as claims 16, 19, 2-23, 33, 34, 44, 45, 55, and 58 (which recited substantially similar features) and all claims that depend therefrom, and an indication of the allowability of same.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at 512-439-5092.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicants hereby petition for such extensions. Applicants also hereby authorize that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to Deposit Account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

Shawn Doman
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 60,362
Telephone: (512) 439-5092
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099

Application No.: 10/033,146